



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,632	05/01/2001	Andrew D. Dubner	56650US002	4391
32692	7590	02/24/2005	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			FRIDIE JR, WILLMON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,632

Applicant(s)

DUBNER ET AL.

Examiner

Willmon Fridie, Jr.

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1,2,9,12,13,23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens.

Stephens discloses all of the subject matter as set forth in the claims and is identical to the invention as broadly recited. Some of the claimed elements clearly disclosed by the reference are: a security feature (16), a transparent fragile layer(12')

Art Unit: 3722

and a transparent durable layer (12"). Further Stephens inherently teaches the method in claims 23 and 24.

Stephens discloses the claimed invention except for claimed layer materials and indicia on one of its transparent layers. Smith teaches that it is well known in the art to provide indicia on a transparent layer associated with an information bearing assembly (see column 2, lines 10-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Stephens with indicia on one of its transparent layers in the manner as taught by Smith in order to Provide more information to the user.

Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any suitable material, since it has been held to be within the general skill level of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

-4. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens as modified by Smith above and further in view of Killey.

Stephens as modified by Smith discloses the claimed invention except for a holographic foil layer. Killey teaches that it is well known in the art to use a holographic foil layer in its assembly. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Stephens as modified by Smith with a holographic foil layer in the manner as taught by Killey in order to enhance the security feature.

5. Claims 4,6,7,8,10,11,14-16,19,20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens as modified by Smith above in view McConville et al..

Stephens as modified by Smith discloses the claimed invention except for a retro reflective layer of glass beads. McConville et al teaches that it is well known in the art to use a retro reflective layer of glass beads (24), hot melt adhesive (32) ,a protective coating lacquer coating and an index coating (26) in his assembly. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Stephens as modified by Smith with a retro reflective layer of glass beads (24), hot melt adhesive (32) ,a protective coating lacquer coating and an index coating (26) in the manner as taught by McConville et al in order to enhance and protect the security feature.

McConville et al further teaches that it is well known to use a composite assembly of the claimed elements in a document of value (see column 1, lines 25-65).

8. – Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens as modified by Smith and further in view of McConville and Killey.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to provide Stephens as modified by Smith with a multi-layer optical film layer and a holographic foil layer in the manner as taught by McConville and Killey for the reasons stated in the previous paragraphs.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 3722

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridie Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 9-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on 571-272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wf


WILLMON FRIDIE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER